arXiv:1601.02711v2 [math.CV] 29 Jun 2016

CONFORMAL CONTRACTIONS AND LOWER BOUNDS ON THE DENSITY OF HARMONIC MEASURE

LEONID V. KOVALEV

Abstract. We give a concrete sufficient condition for a simply-connected domain to be the image of the unit disk under a nonexpansive conformal map. This class of domains is also characterized by having sufficiently dense harmonic measure. The relation with the harmonic measure provides a natural higher-dimensional analogue of this problem, which is also addressed.

1. Introduction

The images of the unit disk $\mathbb{D}$ under conformal maps f with the normalization $f(0) = 0 = f'(0) - 1$ have long been understood and characterized in terms of their Green's function, capacity of the complement, and so on (e.g., the books [5] and [8] expose this circle of ideas). This paper studies the effect of a uniform bound on the derivative of a conformal map: namely, $|f'(z)| \le 1$ for all $z \in \mathbb{D}$. This condition can be equivalently stated as $|f(z) - f(w)| \le |z - w|$ for all $z, w \in \mathbb{D}$; such f may be called a *conformal contraction*. Under the normalization $f(0) = 0$, it follows that the image $f(\mathbb{D})$ must be contained in $\mathbb{D}$. However, not every subdomain of the unit disk is its image under a conformal contraction.

Let us consider a convex domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ that contains 0 and has $C^{1,1}$-smooth boundary. With such a domain we associate three radii:

- *outer radius* R_O is the smallest radius of a disk centered at 0 and containing Ω;
- *inner radius* R_I is the largest radius of a disk centered at 0 and contained in Ω;
- *curvature radius* R_C is the minimal radius of curvature of $\partial\Omega$. It is the largest radius R such that Ω can be written as a union of open disks of radius R.

Note that $R_O \ge R_I$ and $R_O \ge R_C$, while there is no general relation between R_I and R_C.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 30C62; Secondary 31A15, 31B05.
Key words and phrases. conformal map, harmonic measure, Green's function.
Supported by the National Science Foundation grant DMS-1362453.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a convex domain that contains 0 and has $C^{1,1}$-smooth boundary. If the radii R_O, R_I, and R_C satisfy*

$$(R_O - R_C)\frac{\log R_I - \log R_C}{R_I - R_C} + \frac{1}{2}\log R_C \leq 0 \tag{1.1}$$

then $\Omega = f(\mathbb{D})$ for some conformal map f such that $f(0) = 0$ and $\sup|f'| \leq 1$. (When $R_I = R_C$, the difference quotient is understood as $1/R_I$.)

We will also consider the harmonic measure of domain Ω with respect to 0, denoted $\omega_\Omega(\cdot, 0)$. In the context of Theorem 1.1, of particular interest is the Radon-Nikodym derivative of $\omega_\Omega(\cdot, 0)$ with respect to arclength, which will be called the *density* of harmonic measure.

The images of $\mathbb{D}$ under conformal contractions fixing 0 are precisely those domains Ω for which the density of $\omega_\Omega(\cdot, 0)$ is at least $1/(2\pi)$ everywhere on the boundary. This follows immediately from the conformal invariance of harmonic measure and the fact that its density on the boundary of the unit disk is $1/(2\pi)$. Thus, Theorem 1.1 gives a sufficient condition for Ω to have harmonic measure with such a lower density bound.

Theorem 1.1 was prompted by a question of J. E. Tener [7] which arose in the following context. When f is a conformal map of $\mathbb{D}$ into itself with $f(0) = 0$, the composition with f is a contraction on the Hardy space $H^2(\mathbb{D})$, see [3, Corollary 3.7]. By the conformal invariance of harmonic measure, this implies that the restriction operator $R\colon H^2(\mathbb{D}) \to L^2(\partial\Omega, \omega_\Omega(\cdot, 0))$ is a contraction. A lower bound on the density of $\omega_\Omega(\cdot, 0)$ then allows one to estimate the norm of the restriction operator $R\colon H^2(\mathbb{D}) \to L^2(\partial\Omega)$ where L^2 is taken with respect to arclength.

Concerning the structure of condition (1.1) it should be noted that the term

$$(R_O - R_C)\frac{\log R_I - \log R_C}{R_I - R_C}$$

is scale-invariant, while the second term, $\frac{1}{2}\log R_C$, tends to $-\infty$ as the domain is scaled down. Thus, for any convex domain Ω of class $C^{1,1}$ Theorem 1.1 gives an explicit factor $\lambda > 0$ such that the scaled-down domain $\lambda\Omega$ is the image of $\mathbb{D}$ under a conformal contraction. This can be compared to the classical Kellogg-Warschawski theorem [6, Theorem 3.5] which asserts that the conformal map of the disk onto a Dini-smooth Jordan domain Ω has a uniformly continuous derivative. The latter also implies that $\lambda\Omega$ is the image of $\mathbb{D}$ under a conformal contraction for sufficiently small $\lambda > 0$. However, in contrast to Theorem 1.1, one does not have an explicit suitable value of λ in this case.

Examples illustrating and motivating the condition (1.1) are given in §2.

The higher-dimensional version of Theorem 1.1 is stated in terms of the harmonic measure, since there is no longer a rich supply of conformal maps. The desired property of Ω in this case is having the density of $\omega_\Omega(\cdot, 0)$ at least $1/\sigma_{n-1}$, where σ_{n-1} is the surface area of the unit sphere. The quantity

$1/\sigma_{n-1}$ is the density of the harmonic measure of the unit ball with respect to its center. We will also use the notation

$$a^+ = \max(a, 0), \qquad \phi(a, b) = \frac{\log a - \log b}{a - b}, \quad \phi(a, a) = 1/a.$$

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n > 2$, be a convex domain that contains 0 and has $C^{1,1}$-smooth boundary. If the radii R_O, R_I, and R_C satisfy*

$$R_C R_I^{n-2} e^{n(R_O - R_C - R_I/2)^+ \phi(R_I/2, R_C)} \le \frac{2^{n-2} - 1}{2^{n-1}(n-2)} \tag{1.2}$$

then the density of the harmonic measure of Ω with respect to 0 is bounded below by σ_{n-1}^{-1}.

The exponential term in (1.2) is scale invariant, while the factor $R_C R_I^{n-2}$ makes sure that the left hand side of (1.2) tends to 0 as the domain is scaled down.

2. Examples and counterexamples

The sufficient conditions of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 are not necessary; however, they are reasonably precise. For example, in the special case $R_O = R_I = R_C = R$ the hypothesis of Theorem 1.1 is that $R \le 1$, which is both necessary and sufficient in this case. The higher-dimensional estimate is less accurate: the inequality (1.2) simplifies to $R \le \frac{1}{2}((2^{n-2} - 1)/(n-2))^{1/(n-1)}$, where the right hand side is less than 1 but converges to 1 as $n \to \infty$.

To justify the presence of three radii R_O, R_I, R_C in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, let us note that constraining just two of them would not be sufficient for the conclusion. Indeed, a convex polygon has zero density of harmonic measure at the vertices. Slightly rounding the corners, one obtains a domain that fails the conclusion of the theorem, which only the curvature radius detects. To show the necessity of R_I, let Ω be the disk of radius 1 centered at the point $1 - \epsilon$; the density of $\omega_\Omega(\cdot, 0)$ is small on most of the boundary. Finally, letting Ω be the convex hull of the union of two disks such as $D(0, 1) \cup D(n, 1)$ shows that the presence of R_O is also necessary.



Figure 1. A domain in Theorem 1.1

Figure 1 presents a concrete example of a domain that satisfies (1.1), namely a rounded triangle with $R_O = 0.6$, $R_I = 0.5$, and $R_C = 0.4$.

A domain satisfying (1.2) could have $n = 3$, $R_O = 3/4$, and $R_I = R_C = 1/2$.

3. Preliminaries: hyperbolic and quasihyperbolic metrics

The hyperbolic metric on the unit disk $\mathbb{D}$ is

$$\rho_{\mathbb{D}}(z, w) = \inf \int_\gamma \frac{|d\zeta|}{1 - |\zeta|^2}$$

where the infimum is taken over all rectifiable curves γ connecting z and w. In particular,

$$\rho_{\mathbb{D}}(z, 0) = \int_0^{|z|} \frac{dt}{1 - t^2} = \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{1 + |z|}{1 - |z|}. \tag{3.1}$$

On other simply-connected domains the hyperbolic metric can be defined by its conformal invariance property: $\rho_\Omega(f(z), f(w)) = \rho_{\mathbb{D}}(z, w)$ if f is a conformal map of $\mathbb{D}$ onto Ω. In particular, for a disk $\Omega = D(a, R)$ we have

$$\rho_{D(a,R)}(z, a) = \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{R + |z - a|}{R - |z - a|}. \tag{3.2}$$

As a consequence of the Schwarz-Pick lemma, the hyperbolic metric is monotone with respect to domain: if G and Ω are two simply-connected domains and $z, w \in G \subset \Omega$, then

$$\rho_G(z, w) \geq \rho_\Omega(z, w). \tag{3.3}$$

The quasihyperbolic metric ρ^*_Ω is defined by

$$\rho^*_\Omega(z, w) = \inf \int_\gamma \frac{|d\zeta|}{\operatorname{dist}(\zeta, \partial\Omega)}.$$

It is not conformally invariant, but is comparable to ρ_Ω for every simply-connected domain:

$$\frac{1}{4} \rho^*_\Omega(z, w) \leq \rho_\Omega(z, w) \leq \rho^*_\Omega(z, w). \tag{3.4}$$

See [4, §I.4] or [6, §4.6].

4. Planar domains: Proof of Theorem 1.1

When the domain Ω is rescaled by the map $z \mapsto (1 - \epsilon)z$, the left side of (1.1) decreases. Therefore, we may assume that strict inequality holds in (1.1).

Let f be a conformal map of the unit disk $\mathbb{D}$ onto Ω, normalized by $f(0) = 0$. By the Kellogg-Warschawski theorem [6, Theorem 3.5], f' has a continuous extension to $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, and for $\zeta \in \partial\mathbb{D}$ we have

$$\lim_{z \to \zeta,\ z \in \mathbb{D}} \frac{f(z) - f(\zeta)}{z - \zeta} = f'(\zeta). \tag{4.1}$$

By the maximum principle, it suffices to show $|f'| \le 1$ on $\partial\mathbb{D}$. By (4.1) it suffices to show that

$$\lim_{|z|\nearrow 1} \frac{\operatorname{dist}(f(z), \partial\Omega)}{1-|z|} \le 1. \tag{4.2}$$

Fix $z \in \mathbb{D}$ and let $d = \operatorname{dist}(f(z), \partial\Omega)$. Since the small values of d are of interest, we may assume $d < R_C$. Our plan is to estimate $\rho_\Omega(0, f(z))$ from above, which will yield

$$|z| < 1 - d \tag{4.3}$$

for sufficiently small d, thus proving (4.2).

Choose a point $w \in \partial\Omega$ such that $|f(z) - w| = d$. By the definition of R_C, there is a disk $D = D(a, R_C)$ that has w on its boundary and is contained in Ω. Observe that $f(z)$ lies on the radius of this disk connecting a to w, and therefore $|f(z) - a| = R_C - d$. By (3.3) and (3.2),

$$\rho_\Omega(f(z), a) \le \rho_{D(a,R_C)}(f(z), a) = \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{2R_C - d}{d} \le \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{2R_C}{d}. \tag{4.4}$$

To estimate $\rho_\Omega(a, 0)$ we use the comparison with ρ^*_Ω stated in (3.4). Since Ω contains $D(0, R_I)$ and $D(a, R_C)$, the convexity of Ω implies

$$\operatorname{dist}(ta, \partial\Omega) \ge tR_C + (1-t)R_I, \quad 0 \le t \le 1. \tag{4.5}$$

Integration along the line segment from 0 to a yields

$$\rho^*_\Omega(a, 0) \le |a| \int_0^1 \frac{dt}{tR_C + (1-t)R_I} = |a|\phi(R_I, R_C). \tag{4.6}$$

Since $D(a, R_C) \subset \Omega \subset D(0, R_O)$, we have $|a| \le R_O - R_C$. In conclusion,

$$\rho_\Omega(a, 0) \le (R_O - R_C)\phi(R_I, R_C). \tag{4.7}$$

Suppose that (4.3) fails, that is, $|z| \ge 1 - d$. From the conformal invariance of hyperbolic metric,

$$\rho_\Omega(f(z), 0) = \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{1+|z|}{1-|z|} \ge \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{2-d}{d}. \tag{4.8}$$

Combining (4.4), (4.7), and (4.8) we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2}\log\frac{2-d}{d} \le \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{2R_C}{d} + (R_O - R_C)\phi(R_I, R_C),$$

hence

$$\frac{1}{2}\log\left(1 - \frac{d}{2}\right) \le \frac{1}{2}\log R_C + (R_O - R_C)\phi(R_I, R_C). \tag{4.9}$$

Since the right hand side of (4.9) is negative, the inequality implies a lower bound on d. Therefore, (4.3) hold provided that d is sufficiently small. This proves Theorem 1.1.

5. Higher dimensions: proof of Theorem 1.2

In this section Ω is a convex domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n > 2$, and $0 \in \Omega$. The density of $\omega_\Omega(\cdot, 0)$ with respect to the surface measure of $\partial\Omega$ is related to Green's function g_Ω by

$$\omega_\Omega(E, 0) = \int_E \frac{\partial g_\Omega}{\partial n}.$$

Here the derivative is taken along the interior normal, and g_Ω is Green's function with pole at 0, normalized by $g_\Omega(x, 0) = \frac{1}{(n-2)\sigma_{n-1}}|x|^{2-n} + O(1)$ as $x \to 0$.

Thus, to prove that the density of harmonic measure is no less than σ_{n-1}^{-1}, it suffices to show that

$$g_\Omega(x) \geq \frac{1 + o(1)}{\sigma_{n-1}} \operatorname{dist}(x, \partial\Omega), \quad x \to \partial\Omega. \tag{5.1}$$

To this end we use a lower bound for g_Ω in terms of the quasihyperbolic metric. An estimate of this kind is given in Section 1.2 of [1], namely $g_\Omega(x, 0) \geq \exp(-A\rho^*_\Omega(x, 0))$ with unspecified A. But we need a more explicit bound, since the presence of A in the exponent does not allow one to conclude with (5.1).

Fix $x \in \Omega$ and let $d = \operatorname{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)$, assuming $d < R_C$. Choose a point $w \in \partial\Omega$ such that $|x - w| = d$. By the definition of R_C, there is a ball $B(a, R_C)$ that has w on its boundary and is contained in Ω. Since $|x - a| = R_C - d$, Harnack's inequality [2, Theorem 1.4.1] yields

$$g_\Omega(x) \geq \frac{(R_C - |x - a|)R_C^{n-2}}{(R_C + |x - a|)^{n-1}} g_\Omega(a) = \frac{d\, R_C^{n-2}}{(2R_C - d)^{n-1}} g_\Omega(a). \tag{5.2}$$

Since $B(0, R_I) \subset \Omega$, it follows that the restriction of g_Ω to $B(0, R_I)$ is minorized by Green's function of this ball: specifically,

$$g_\Omega(x) \geq \frac{1}{(n-2)\sigma_{n-1}}(|x|^{2-n} - R_I^{2-n}), \quad |x| < R_I. \tag{5.3}$$

In particular, at the point $a' = \frac{R_I}{2}\frac{a}{|a|}$ we have

$$g_\Omega(a') \geq \frac{2^{n-2} - 1}{(n-2)\sigma_{n-1}} R_I^{2-n}. \tag{5.4}$$

As a corollary of Harnack's inequality [2, Corollary 1.4.2], the gradient of a positive harmonic function on $B(a, r)$ satisfies $|\nabla u(a)| \leq (n/r)u(a)$. Therefore,

$$|\nabla \log g_\Omega(x)| \leq n/\operatorname{dist}(x, \partial\Omega')$$

where $\Omega' = \Omega \setminus \{0\}$. This implies

$$|\log g_\Omega(x) - \log g_\Omega(y)| \leq n\rho^*_{\Omega'}(x, y). \tag{5.5}$$

Case 1: $|a| \geq R_I/2$. Since $|a'| = R_I/2 \leq |a| \leq R_O - R_C$ and a' is a scalar multiple of a, it follows that $|a - a'| \leq (R_O - R_C - R_I/2)$. Observe that

the domain Ω' contains the balls $B(a', R_I/2)$ and $B(a, R_C)$, as well as their convex hull. Integration similar to (4.6) yields

$$\rho^*_{\Omega'}(a, a') \le |a - a'|\phi(R_I/2, R_C) \le (R_O - R_C - R_I/2)\phi(R_I/2, R_C).$$

Using (5.5) we obtain

$$g_\Omega(a) \ge \frac{2^{n-2} - 1}{(n-2)\sigma_{n-1}} R_I^{2-n} e^{-n(R_O - R_C - R_I/2)\phi(R_I/2, R_C)}.$$

Case 2: $|a| < R_I/2$. Instead of using a', we have

$$g_\Omega(a) \ge \frac{2^{n-2} - 1}{(n-2)\sigma_{n-1}} R_I^{2-n}$$

as in (5.4).

Thus, in either case

$$g_\Omega(a) \ge \frac{2^{n-2} - 1}{(n-2)\sigma_{n-1}} R_I^{2-n} e^{-n(R_O - R_C - R_I/2)^+\phi(R_I/2, R_C)}$$

which by virtue of (5.2) implies

(5.6)

$$\frac{\sigma_{n-1} g_\Omega(x)}{d} \ge \frac{R_C^{n-2}}{(2R_C - d)^{n-1}} \frac{2^{n-2} - 1}{n-2} R_I^{2-n} e^{-n(R_O - R_C - R_I/2)^+\phi(R_I/2, R_C)}.$$

As $d \to 0$, the right hand side of (5.6) converges to

$$\frac{2^{n-2} - 1}{2^{n-1}(n-2)} \frac{1}{R_C R_I^{n-2}} e^{-n(R_O - R_C - R_I/2)^+\phi(R_I/2, R_C)} \ge 1.$$

This proves (5.1) and concludes the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Acknowledgement. I would like to thank the referee for carefully reading the paper and suggesting several improvements.

References

[1] H. Aikawa, *Intrinsic ultracontractivity via capacitary width*, Rev. Mat. Iberoam., 31, no. 3, 1041–1106 (2015).

[2] D. H. Armitage, S. J. Gardiner, Classical potential theory. Springer-Verlag (2001)

[3] C. C. Cowen, B. D. MacCluer, Composition operators on spaces of analytic functions. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, (1995)

[4] J. B. Garnett, D. E. Marshall, Harmonic measure. Cambridge University Press (2005)

[5] G. M. Goluzin, Geometric theory of functions of a complex variable. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I. (1969)

[6] Ch. Pommerenke, Boundary behaviour of conformal maps. Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1992)

[7] J. E. Tener, Bounds on the derivative of a Riemann map, MathOverflow. `http://mathoverflow.net/q/165037`

[8] M. Tsuji, Potential theory in modern function theory. Maruzen Co., Ltd., Tokyo (1959)

215 Carnegie, Mathematics Department, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY 13244

E-mail address: `lvkovale@syr.edu`